

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/659,150 09/10/2003		Atsushi Ogawa	82478-0600	3027	
21611	7590	06/08/2005	EXAMINER		
SNELL & V		LLP	SAFAVI, MICHAEL		
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA	A 92614-	7230	3673		

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ar	pplication No.	Applicant(s)				
		10	0/659,150	OGAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Sumi		201	aminer	Art Unit				
		M.	Safavi	3673				
				with the correspondence address				
Period fo	• •							
THE - Externalizer - If the - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PER MAILING DATE OF THIS CON nsions of time may be available under the p SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the period for reply specified above is less that a period for reply is specified above, the mailing to reply within the set or extended period reply received by the Office later than three ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	MMUNICATION. rovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). his communication. n thirty (30) days, a reply withi ximum statutory period will apy I for reply will, by statute, caus months after the mailing date	In no event, however, may in the statutory minimum of ply and will expire SIX (6) M te the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communic ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.			
Status		,,						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication	n(s) filed on <u>14 Marct</u>	<u> 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL.							
3)	- · ·		•	atters, prosecution as to the merit	ts is			
	closed in accordance with the	practice under Ex pa	arte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in	the application.		·				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s)		rom consideration.	•				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed							
	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) is/are objected							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to	restriction and/or ele	ection requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers							
9) 🗌 '	The specification is objected to	by the Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on		·	-				
	Applicant may not request that ar	• •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,				
44)		=	•	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12				
11)	The oath or declaration is obje	cted to by the Examil	ner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152	2.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
•	Acknowledgment is made of a	• .	rity under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	•			
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ Non							
	1. Certified copies of the p							
	2. Certified copies of the p	-						
			•	en received in this National Stage	;			
* 0	application from the Inte See the attached detailed Office	•	, ,,	nt received				
	see the attached detailed Office	s action for a list of th	ie cerunea copies in	or received.				
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)				
1) 🔲 Notic	•							
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Remation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-	-	Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3673

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 2

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Zur, Wu, and Bartlett et al. in view of Larson and further in view of any of Lidow, Forbes, and Blair when further considering Higgins et al.

Each of Zur, Wu, and Bartlett et al. disclose beds possessing a tilt unit operable to perform a tilting operation including tilting of a longitudinal extent of the bed as well as elevating the upper body and bending the knees.

Larson teaches controlling a parameter of a bed, namely heat, as by utilizing a judgment unit to detect the body temperature of a person and relaying the judgment unit information to a control unit operable to control the temperature of the bed based upon the result of the judgment by the judgment unit, col. 3,line 58 to col. 4, line 2. Larson teaches a relationship between the body temperature and REM sleep, col. 1, lines 52-57.

Each of Lidow, Forbes, and Blair teach effecting an action when any particular sleep period is identified, see for example, the abstracts of each of Lidow, Forbes, and Blair.

Art Unit: 3673

Higgins et al. teaches the tendency for posture positioning change during sleep, col. 1, lines 41-49 while recognizing the various cycles or stages of sleep including REM and deep sleep.

Though Higgins et al. does not specifically recite automatic posture positioning change during sleep one of ordinary skill in the art would extract a desire for such an automatic positioning change without arousing the person at sleep, (i.e., relieving any pressure prior to the pressure affecting the occupant). See particularly, Zur, which desires tilting of the bed to sustain comfort for the occupant. Therefore, to have provided the tilt unit beds of any of Zur, Wu, and Bartlett et al. with a judgment unit to detect any particular stage or cycle of sleep including REM sleep and deep sleep, as well as provide a control unit operable to control the tilting of the bed based upon the result of the judgment, (i.e., indication of particular stage of sleep), by the judgment unit, thus allowing a more continuous sound sleep, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by Larson when considering any of Lidow, Forbes, and Blair when further considering Higgins et al. Providing for the control unit to prohibit the tilt unit from performing the tilt operation within a predetermined time period from completion of an immediately preceding tilt operation, irrespective of which sleep stage the person is in would have constituted a further obvious expedient to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, particularly in view of the Higgins et al. suggestion that less movement would result in a more sound sleep.

Art Unit: 3673

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that the "... Office Action has brought together nine references. However, the instant rejection utilizes only four references to propose the combination. In any event, Bartlett et al. does teach elevating the upper body and bending the knees as can be seen between Figs. 1 and 2 of Bartlett et al. Likewise, each of Zur and Wu teach elevating the upper body and bending the knees.

As for the combination of references, one of ordinary skill in the art would extract from the teachings of Larson any of Lidow/Forbes/Blair, and Higgins et al. the suggestion to provide the tilt unit beds of any of Zur, Wu, and Bartlett et al. with a judgment unit to detect any particular stage or cycle of sleep including REM sleep and deep sleep, and to provide a control unit operable to control the tilting of the bed based upon the result of the judgment by the judgment unit. As set forth in the above rejection this would allow a more continuous sound sleep, which is what any of Zur, Wu, Bartlett et al., Larson, and Higgins et al. desire.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Safavi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7046. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on (571) 272-7049. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Safavi May 25, 2005

MICHAEL SAFAVI PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 354